

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION
9

10
11 SAN LUIS OBISPO COASTKEEPER,
12 LOS PADRES FORESTWATCH,
13 CALIFORNIA COASTKEEPER
ALLIANCE, and THE ECOLOGICAL
RIGHTS FOUNDATION,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 vs.

16 COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO,

17 Defendant.
18
19
20

Case No: 2:24-cv-06854 SPG (ASx)

DISCOVERY MATTER

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER GRANTING
STIPULATED MOTION TO
AMEND COUNTY OF SAN LUIS
OBISPO'S RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION
NOS. 6, 18, AND 21 [ECF NO. 119]**

~~Date: June 12, 2025~~

~~Time: 10:00 AM~~

~~Dept: 540~~

Date Action Filed: August 13, 2024

21
22 On May 14, 2025, Defendant County of San Luis Obispo ("County") filed a
23 Stipulated Motion to Amend the County's Responses to Plaintiffs' Second Requests
24 for Admission Nos. 6, 18, and 21. The Court, having considered the Stipulated
25 Motion and finding good cause thereon, hereby GRANTS the Stipulated Motion.

26 The County's Responses to Plaintiffs Second Requests for Admission are
27 hereby amended as follows:

28 1. The County's Response to Requests for Admission No. 6 now states:

1 “The County hereby incorporates by reference General Objections 3–6 to
2 this Request. The County further objects that this Request is vague and ambiguous
3 in referring to “ponds” in the plural without providing an adequate description of
4 the specific locations and/or other information such that each pond referenced in
5 the Request is clearly identified.

6 Subject to the County’s Preliminary Statement, General Objections, and the
7 specific objections identified above, the County answers as follows: The County
8 admits that it has authority and control over the maintenance of the frog ponds that
9 are located at or near the base of Lopez Dam and that it does maintain these frog
10 ponds.”

11 2. The County’s Response to Requests for Admission No. 18 now states:

12 “The County hereby incorporates by reference General Objections 3–6 to
13 this Request.

14 Subject to the County’s Preliminary Statement and General Objections
15 identified above, the County answers as follows: The County admits it owns,
16 operates and maintains the double arch culvert at Biddle Regional Park, subject to
17 any limitations stemming from exercise of applicable federal and state laws or
18 regulatory authorities.”

19 3. The County’s Response to Requests for Admission No. 21 now states:

20 “The County hereby incorporates by reference General Objections 3–6 to
21 this Request. The County further objects to this Request as an impermissible
22 compound request.

23 Subject to the County’s Preliminary Statement and General Objections
24 identified above, the County answers as follows: The County denies it operated
25 and maintained the concrete weir structure that was in Tar Springs Creek and
26 identified as fish impediment PAD_ID736895 (Passage ID 13262). After
27 reasonable inquiry, the County lacks information sufficient to determine whether it
28

1 owned the structure PAD_ID736895 (Passage ID 13262), and therefore denies that
2 it did. The County admits it removed the structure when the bridge was replaced.”
3

4 Accordingly the hearing set for June 12, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. is hereby
5 VACATED.
6
7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
9
10

11 Dated: May 15, 2025

/ s / Sagar

12 Hon. Alka Sagar
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28